

Draft Minutes

Little Compton Building Committee – April 28, 2010 , 7:00 pm School Commons

Members in attendance: Tom Alder, , Dave MacGregor, Don Gomez, Bob Mushen, Micah Shapiro, Tom Arkins, Superintendent Harold Devine, Principal Jim Gibney, BG Shanklin, Margaret Manning, Beryl Borden, Mark Rapp, John Osbourne, Jake Talbot, Russ Racette

Members absent: Don Wordell, Ben Gauthier, Lynn Brousseau

The meeting was called to order at 7:10 pm by Chairman Tom Alder

Approve minutes from March 24 th meeting: Motion made to approve minutes by Tom Alder, seconded by Don Gomez. Approved unanimously.

Public Input: None

Chairman Report: Discussion on Timeline. Mr. Alder indicated that June 1st was the date that we had to have an Architect under contract. A general discussion was had regarding the Architectural interviews, the selection, and the negotiating session that would ensue. It was indicated by Dr. Devine that once the School Committee has approved to fund the negotiated dollar amount with the winning firm, we could then initiate a contract with the chosen firm. Tom Arkins asked if it might be possible for the School Committee to approve a dollar amount in anticipation of a negotiated contract. Dr. Devine indicated that this would be possible, but recommended that the School Committee might be more comfortable in voting on an actual negotiated figure, rather than requesting the School Committee to vote to designate a “range” of figures. Tom

Arkins indicated that given the time constraints, that we may want to consider asking the School Committee to consider voting to accept a “not to exceed” figure. Mr. Arkins then brought into question, as a “critical path item”, the contract that will need to be written, and asked who might write the final contract. Dr. Devine indicated that it should be written by an attorney, either the Town Solicitor, or the school attorney. Dr. Devine also said that it was a bit premature to consider the contract, and that we needed to focus on the things that needed to be done to get a winning firms negotiated price to the School Committee for approval.

Slating Committee Report – The report was given by Tom Arkins. We received fifteen proposals in response to our Architectural RFP. Six firms were selected for further consideration. The slated firms were presented to the Full Committee. They were Durkee Brown Viveiros Werenfels Architects, Jonathan Levi Architects, Sacoccio and Associates, Newport Collaborative Architects, Robinson Green & Berreta, and SMMA. Mr. Arkins then highlighted the schedule that would be followed. Tom Alder would be notifying the slated firms on Thursday the 29th that we would be meeting with them in the immediate future. The Architectural Firms would be invited to tour the school individually on Saturday May 1st, if possible. Monday the 3rd, and Tuesday the 4th would be used as alternative dates. The slated firms would then be brought into to meet with the Selection subcommittee individually on May 11th and 12th.

There was then discussion on the slate, select, negotiate process

that we had put in place. It was determined that, after the site visit, the “Selection” subcommittee would interview the firms individually for one hour, and that they would make their recommendations to the Full Committee, and that the Committee as a whole would make the final decision after each firm had made a formal presentation. The final presentations to the Full Committee would be on May 13th.

Site Committee Report: BG Shanklin indicated that a preliminary Site Survey had been completed by Civil Engineering Concepts. He indicated that ten out of the eighteen items in the RFP had been completed. The contract from Bill Smith was in three parts. The first part was completed, with the exception of the septic evaluation and the storm water calculations. Tom Arkins indicated that there were three things that we had identified as “critical path items” in the regard to the Site Survey. They were the wetlands delineation, the septic evaluation, and the water supply volumes. It was determined that of these three items, that only the wetland delineation had been completed. Mr. Arkins stated that we were to have asked that these items be completed by April 12th. Mr. Shanklin indicated that this date was not in the contract, and that the date in the contract was in fact April 28th. Mr. Shanklin stated that he would contact Mr. Smith of Civil Engineering Concepts to provide the remaining items. Tom Alder spoke of a conversation that he had with Bill Smith regarding an indetermineable ground water infiltration into the septic system. Bob Mushen stated that a problem has existed with the system since its inception, and that when abnormally heavy rains are experienced,

that this groundwater inflow is made apparent.

BG Shanklin stated to the Committee that he had been observing the drop off and pick up volumes of vehicles at the school. He has been recording this information, and will compile this information. He stated that he noted 48 parking spaces needed for the school staff. Mr. Shanklin observed an inherent problem with the parent and school bus drop-offs, indicating that a lack of separation between the two would continue to be of concern.

Public Outreach Report – Tom Alder reported that the public input session immediately preceding this meeting was “successful”. It was noted that there were thirty-three members of the general public in attendance. It was requested by a member of the public that it would be helpful if we could schedule a public input session during the day so that parents could attend.

Committee Business:

A motion made by Tom Arkins, and seconded by Dave Macgregor, was made to accept the six slated firms. General discussion ensued. There was concern by Beryl Borden that the firm of SMMA had been involved in litigation in regards to a structural defect that had existed in a project in Lynn, MA. She expressed some concern in considering them as a slated firm. Dr. Devine expressed disappointment in Mount Vernon Group not being selected. He understood the slating committees omission of MVG which was based solely on their proposals. Dr. Devine indicated that based on

personal experience with the MVG, that they are a very qualified firm, and their track record on projects that he had personal experience with is exemplary. Principal Gibney echoed these sentiments. Tom Alder suggested that the Mount Vernon Group might be worth consideration based on these testimonials. On a motion made by Don Gomez and seconded by Russ Racette, the original motion was ammended to include the Mount Vernon Group. It was then suggested that in order to keep our slating list at six, that SMMA be removed based on the concerns that were raised earlier. This amendment to the original motion passed by a seven to five margin, with two abstentions, adding the Mount Vernon Group.

An amendment to the original motion , removing RGB from the slated list, was made by Tom Arkins, and seconded by Dr. Devine. It was noted during discussion that RGB was instrumental in bringing the Committee to establish a renovation “sense”. This amendment failed by a five to nine vote.

An amendment to the original motion was made by Dave MacGregor, and seconded by Beryl Borden to remove SMMA from the slated list. This motion passed by an eight to six margin.

A vote on the original motion was then taken to accept DBVW, JLA, MVG, RGB, Saccoccio & Associates, and Newport Collaborative as the slated Architectural Firms. This motion passed unanimously.

Chairman Tom Alder than presented the list of members that he was appointing to the Negotiating Committee. They included: Ben Gauthier, Bob Mushen, Dr. Devine, Russ Racette and Don Gomez. Tom Arkins and Jake Talbot felt as though there needed to be better

representation from the slating committee on the negotiating committee, as it had been determined initially that the “select/negotiate” committee would be one in the same. After a lengthy debate, Chairman Tom Alder appointed Tom Arkins and Jake Talbot to the Negotiating Committee, bringing total membership to seven.

There was then a discussion regarding a hazardous material review. Margaret Manning recounted the information that we had to date, and that a potential renovation would need to identify and address any hazardous material that may exist in the building. A motion was made by Mrs. Manning to initiate an RFP to conduct a Hazmat Review, but before it was seconded, Russ Racette indicated that the RFP required the contracted A&E Firm to conduct said review. Mrs. Manning withdrew her motion under the assumption that this would be completed as part of the Stage II process.

The next meeting was scheduled for May 13th at 5:00, with the regularly scheduled meeting set for May 26th at 7:00 pm, both at the School Commons.

On a motion made by Tom Alder, and seconded by Don Gomez, it was unanimously voted to adjourn at 9:45.

Respectfully submitted,

Tom Alder

LCSBC Chairman